## REMARKS

- 1. Reconsideration and further prosecution of the aboveidentified application are respectfully requested in view
  of the amendments and discussion that follows. Claims 1-52
  are pending in this application. Claims 2, 4, 6-13, 17,
  18, 20-23, 24, 26-34, 37, 38, 40-46 and 48-52 have been
  rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S.
  Pat. No. 5,465,286 to Clare et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No.
  6,577,726 to Huang et al. Claims 3, 5, 14-16, 19, 25, 35,
  36, 39 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as
  being obvious over Clare et al. in view of Huang et al. and
  U.S. Patent No. 5,465,286 to Matsuda et al. After a
  careful review of the claims (as amended), it has been
  concluded that the rejections are in error and the
  rejections are, therefore, traversed.
- 2. Claims 2, 4, 6-13, 17, 18, 20-23, 24, 26-34, 37, 38, 40-46 and 48-52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Clare et al. in view Huang et al. response, claims 1, 23 and 44 have been further limited to the method steps of (and apparatus for) "monitoring a database of the call center by an application within a supervisors workstation for log ons and log offs by entities of the call center to identify consoles being used by the entities . . . monitoring physical location information of entities within the lookup table by an event handler within the supervisors workstation based upon the configuration information within the lookup table to provide an electronic floor plan". Support for the further limitations of monitoring the database, and the use of the application and event handler for processing configuration

information may be found within the specification at page 10, line 19 to page 27, line 18.

In contrast to the claimed system that monitors a database for log ons and log offs, Clare et al. uses radio transceivers 70 to identify a location of its agents.

Rather than identifying a console used by an agent, the Clare et al. transceivers 70 merely "displays the associated transceiver's address and a list of all phones associated with that transceiver" (Clare et al., col. 15, lines 4-5).

Similarly, under Clare et al. "the supervisor may then list the agents at their corresponding telephone locations on the map screen by agent name, abbreviation, or other designation, such as icons or figures, as shown in FIG. 6" (Clare et al., col. 10, lines 44-47). In this regard, the supervisor would necessarily have to list the agents at their corresponding telephone locations because the Clare et al. system can only provide "a list of all phones associated with that transceiver". Since the supervisor must update the map screen, Clare et al. cannot automatically update the map screen, as under the claimed invention.

Similarly, Huang fails to provide any teaching regarding the monitoring of a database for log ons and log offs by an application within a supervisors workstation in the context of the claimed invention. On a first level, Huang fails to show or describe a supervisors workstation. As such, there is no teaching or suggestion of an application in Huang that monitors a database for log ons and log offs.

Further, even if Huang did have a workstation (which it does not), the monitoring would be for another reason.

For example, the sole purpose of Huang is merely to provide telesets to a subscriber. The provision of telesets is entirely different than the monitoring of log ons and log offs to identify a console being used by an entity.

Further, there is no indication that the logins of Huang are specific to any particular entity that logs on. In this regard, "If a workstation is enabled, the application will use the hostname to find the teleset, and the configuration" (Huang, col. 5, lines 5-6). Since Huang merely uses a host name instead of the entity using the console, there would be no way of linking an identifier of the entity to a particular console.

For any of the above reasons, the combination of Clare et al. and Huang is believed to fail to teach each and every claim limitation. Since the combination fails to teach each and every claim limitation, the rejections are believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.

3. Claims 3, 5, 14-16, 19, 25, 35, 36, 39 and 47 have been rejected as being obvious over Clare et al. in view of Huang et al. and Matsuda et al. However, Matsuda et al., as with Huang et al. and Clare et al. is not directed to locating agents based upon logging in or logging out of a database of a call center, to an application within a workstation of a supervisors station that detects such log ons and log offs or an event application that automatically updates an electronic floor plan based upon the updates. As such, the combination cannot be said to teach or suggest each and every element of the invention as now claimed. Since the combination does not teach or suggest the invention as now claimed, the rejections are now improper and should be withdrawn.

4. Allowance of claims 1-52, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted, WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

Jon A /Christensen

Ву

Registration No. 34,137

June 2, 2004 WELSH & KATZ, LTD. 120 South Riverside Plaza 22nd Floor Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 655-1500